

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application, as presently amended, is respectfully requested. Claims 3 and 4 are now pending in the present application. Claims 3 and 4 stand rejected. For the reasons set forth in detail below, the rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over **Mizoguchi** (USP 5,841,466, previously cited) in view of **Iwasa** (WO 02/42890, previously cited) and **Okamoto** (USP 5,465,083, previously cited). For the reasons set forth below, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

Initially, it is noted that the Examiner repeats verbatim the same rejection as set forth in the previous Office Action. Therefore, the comments below will attempt to address the Examiner's *Response to Arguments*.

Firstly, the Examiner relies on **Okamoto** to teach a circuit that nullifies operation of keys of an operation unit (i.e., "*a circuit for...nullifying operation of keys of the operation unit in response to the circuit for comparing indicating that the registered password and the password received from the external computer coincide with each other*"). See Office Action, page 4, third paragraph.

In **Okamoto's** device, when the pressed keys correspond to a certain combination of pressed keys (YES at step S106), sending of key code to the keyboard controller 16 is inhibited, and the password input mode is activated (YES at step S103).

In the password input mode, the user enters a password. After the end of the first password entry, the operation mode goes on to the password check mode (YES at step S104).

In the password check mode, the user performs the second password entry. That is, the user reenters the same password as that inputted immediately before. When the second entered password matches the first entered password, that password is registered as a password for the current use. In addition, the processing for transmitting input from the mouse 14 to the CPU 11 is prohibited. That is, the key lock mode is on (YES at step S105).

In **Okamoto**, the user inputs the password twice because a predetermined password is not registered in the data input controller. Specifically, the user can enter an arbitrary password at the first password input. Then, inputting the same password at the second password entry causes registration of that password for the current use. Therefore, to activate the key lock mode in **Okamoto's** device, it is simply required to input the same password consecutively twice, without the need of inputting a predetermined password.

In the present invention, in contrast, the same password as that registered in the liquid crystal projector in advance needs to be sent from the external computer to the liquid crystal projector in order to nullify key entry by the operation means of the liquid crystal projector.

Specifically, in the present invention, unless the password registered in the liquid crystal projector in advance is provided from the external computer to the liquid crystal projector, nullification of key input by the operation means of the liquid crystal projector is not possible.

In **Okamoto**, in contrast, when the same password (an arbitrary password) is entered consecutively twice after inputting a certain combination of pressed keys, the processing for transmitting input from the mouse 14 to the CPU 11 can be prohibited.

In **Okamoto**, when the same password as registered on the device (the current password registered in the aforementioned manner) is input in the key lock mode, the key lock mode is released.

Secondly, **Okamoto** does not disclose or suggest a liquid crystal projector that nullifies the operation of keys of an operation unit of the liquid crystal projector in response to a password from an external computer coinciding with a registered password. That is, **Okamoto** does not disclose a liquid crystal projector including “a circuit [means] for comparing, in response to *receiving the password from the external computer*, the received password with the registered password and for...nullifying operation *of keys of the operation unit [of the liquid crystal projector] in response to* the circuit [means] for comparing indicating that the registered password and the *password received from the external computer coincide with each other.*”

The **Okamoto** reference teaches nullifying the operation of keys of a keyboard 13 of a computer *in response to key entry to the very same keyboard whose keys are being nullified.*

Okamoto quite clearly does not disclose or suggest that a password received from *an external computer* is used to nullify keys of the keyboard 13.

Further, **Okamoto** does not even disclose or suggest a liquid crystal projector having an operation unit whose keys could be nullified when a password from an external computer coincides with a registered password.

Arguments in accordance with those presented in the three paragraphs directly above were presented in the previous response. It is not entirely clear where the Examiner has responded to the arguments presented in the three paragraphs directly above. It is noted that the Examiner makes the statement “it is reasonable to add such a system [of Okamoto] to Mizoguchi, and such a combined system would [satisfy] the claim limitations because the inhibited device would be the keypad of Mizoguchi which is also used for password input.” See, e.g., page 5, lines 14-16 of the final Office Action.

However, the Examiner relies on the keypad 14 of **Mizoguchi** to teach the claimed “operation unit”. See final Office Action, page 2, last paragraph, citing numerical buttons 14 in Fig. 2. Therefore, the proposed combination of references would teach inhibiting operation of the operation unit (keypad 14), which is the only device for entering a password in **Mizoguchi**, in response to receiving a password from the operation unit (keypad 14). The combined references do not teach “allowing operation of the liquid crystal projector by the external computer” performed “in response to receiving the password from the external computer”.

Moreover, the Examiner is reminded that all claim limitations must be considered when judging the patentability of the claim against the prior art. See Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP) 2144.03. It is respectfully submitted that it appears that the Examiner has relied on the **Okamoto** reference to teach the general concept of nullifying keys, and, when judging patentability, *has not considered how the claimed nullifying of keys is accomplished and how it interrelates to other claimed elements. The claimed interrelationships between claim elements are part of the claimed invention and must be considered when judging patentability.*

Finally, it is noted that the Examiner relies on **Mizoguchi** to teach the claimed “external computer for operating the liquid crystal projector...connected to the liquid crystal projector by radio or wire”. See Office Action, page 2, fourth paragraph. However, the Office Action cites Fig. 3, elements 8 and 22 of **Mizoguchi** to correspond to the “external computer”. Element 8 is an optical visualizing means and element 22 is a liquid crystal display means. These elements are clearly not an “external computer” and clearly do not issue any password.

Thirdly, it is submitted that combination of references destroys the function of the references, and therefore a *prima facie* case of obviousness cannot be made. It is well established that a §103 rejection based upon a modification of a reference that destroys the intent, purpose or function of the invention disclosed in the reference is not proper and the *prima facie* case of obviousness cannot be properly made. To the contrary, there would be disincentive for combining the references. *In re Gordon*, 733 F.2d 900, 221 USPQ 1125 (Fed. Cir. 1984)). See also MPEP 2143.01(V).

The Examiner relies on **Mizoguchi** to teach the claimed “operation unit”, citing numerical buttons 14 in Fig. 2, which it is assumed are considered to correspond to the claimed portion of the operation unit comprising “command entry unit to enter a command to control the liquid crystal projector *via key entry*”. See final Office Action, page 2, last paragraph.

The Examiner further relies on **Mizoguchi** to teach a circuit that allows operation of the liquid crystal projector by the external computer when passwords coincide (i.e., “*a circuit... for allowing operation of the liquid crystal projector by the external computer...in response to the circuit for comparing indicating that the registered password and the password received from the external computer coincide with each other*”). See final Office Action, page 3, third paragraph.

And, as discussed above, the Examiner relies on **Okamoto** for the teaching of a circuit that nullifies operation of keys of the operation unit (i.e., “*a circuit for...nullifying operation of keys of the operation unit in response to the circuit for comparing indicating that the registered password and the password received from the external computer coincide with each other*”). See final Office Action, page 4, third paragraph.

Thus, in rejecting the claim it is clear that the Examiner relies on **Mizoguchi** to teach part of the claim element and relies on **Okamoto** to teach another part of the claim element.

However, if the **Okamoto** reference is interpreted in the manner the Examiner asserts¹

¹ As discussed, Applicants do not agree with the position that **Okamoto** teaches nullifying the operation of keys in response to a password match with a password registered in an operation unit of the liquid crystal projector. **Okamoto** teaches (1) locking keys in response to pressing a certain combination of keys, (2) registering a password, and (3) releasing the key lock state when an entered password matches the registered password.

and the teaching of a key lock state for keys on a keyboard (i.e., nullifying keys) of a data input device is combined with **Mizoguchi**, the result would be a device that nullifies (i.e., locks) the operation of the numerical buttons 14 (operation unit), which are used to enter a password, of the remote controller 5 of **Mizoguchi** in response to an entered password coinciding with a registered password. The Examiner agrees with this, as the Examiner states in the *Response to Arguments*, “Okamoto clearly teaches the *inhibition of the input device that is used to input the password...*” [Emphasis added]. See final Office Action page 5, lines 10-11.

Because **Mizoguchi** teaches that the numerical buttons 14 form a password input device (see col. 2, lines 27-28), by the Examiner’s own admission, it is clear that the result of the combination of **Okamoto** with **Mizoguchi** would be a device that, upon detecting a password match, would nullify operation of the numerical buttons 14 that are used to input the password.

However, *nullifying the operation of the numerical buttons 14 would destroy the function* of the **Mizoguchi** device because the numerical buttons 14 are used to enter a password to continue operation of the device (see e.g., col. 4, lines 4-6). Thus, the disclosed function of the optical visualizing apparatus of **Mizoguchi** would be destroyed when the operation of the numerical buttons 14 is nullified.

Additional Comments

In the *Response to Arguments*, the Examiner asserts “[the] claims fail to recite that the input of the password has to allow access to the LCD as well as inhibit the keyboard *at the same*

time which means that the password can be at separate times...” [Emphasis added]. See final Office Action, page 6, lines 4-7.

It is respectfully submitted that this is an improper interpretation of the claim language. That is, the claims define that both “allowing operation of the liquid crystal projector by the external computer and nullifying operation of keys of the operation unit” are performed *in response* to the same password (i.e., “the password received from the personal computer”). In the claim, the operations of “allowing operation of the liquid crystal projector by the external computer and nullifying operation of keys of the operation unit” are *not in response* to passwords entered at different times.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been made because the combination of references does not teach or suggest all claim elements and because the combination of references destroys the function of at least one of the references. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under §103 are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. A prompt and favorable reconsideration of the rejection and an indication of allowability of all pending claims are earnestly solicited.

Application No.: 10/644,068
Art Unit: 2629


Amendment under 37 C.F.R. §1.116
Attorney Docket No.: 031016

If the Examiner believes that there are issues remaining to be resolved in this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below to arrange for an interview to expedite and complete prosecution of this case.

If this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such an extension or any other fees that may be due with respect to this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "William M. Schertler". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "William" and last name "Schertler" clearly distinguishable.

William M. Schertler
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 35,348
Telephone: (202) 822-1100
Facsimile: (202) 822-1111

WMS/ar